



THE UNIVERSITY *of* EDINBURGH

Edinburgh Research Explorer

Learning to use teaching for personal and social responsibility through action research

Citation for published version:

Gray, S, Wright, PM, Sievwright, R & Robertson, S 2019, 'Learning to use teaching for personal and social responsibility through action research', *Journal of Teaching in Physical Education*, pp. 1-32.
<https://doi.org/10.1123/jtpe.2018-0190>

Digital Object Identifier (DOI):

[10.1123/jtpe.2018-0190](https://doi.org/10.1123/jtpe.2018-0190)

Link:

[Link to publication record in Edinburgh Research Explorer](#)

Document Version:

Peer reviewed version

Published In:

Journal of Teaching in Physical Education

Publisher Rights Statement:

Accepted author manuscript version reprinted, by permission, from Journal of Teaching in Physical Education , [2019] (ahead of print). © Human Kinetics, Inc.

General rights

Copyright for the publications made accessible via the Edinburgh Research Explorer is retained by the author(s) and / or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing these publications that users recognise and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

Take down policy

The University of Edinburgh has made every reasonable effort to ensure that Edinburgh Research Explorer content complies with UK legislation. If you believe that the public display of this file breaches copyright please contact openaccess@ed.ac.uk providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.



RUNNING HEAD: TEACHING TPSR

Learning to use Teaching for Personal and Social Responsibility through action research

Shirley Gray

University of Edinburgh

Paul M. Wright

Northern Illinois University

Richard Sievwright

City of Edinburgh Council

Stuart Robertson

City of Edinburgh Council

22

Abstract

23 *Purpose.* The purpose this investigation was to explore the learning experiences of two teachers
24 from different secondary schools in Scotland as they engaged in their respective action research
25 projects to learn to apply TPSR in physical education. *Method.* Both teachers worked within a
26 small community of practice and used qualitative methods to gather data to inform their inquiry.
27 The teachers shared their findings with their co-authors and engaged in further, more focused
28 analyses to explore and understand their learning experiences and the learning experiences of
29 their pupils. *Results.* Both teachers found that their learning in context was much slower and
30 more challenging than first expected. Over time, both teachers learned to set ‘new’ learning
31 objectives, applied ‘new’ teaching strategies, talked more to their pupils, and reflected with others
32 to evaluate their learning. *Discussion/Conclusion.* When teachers are committed to their own
33 learning and when the subject of their learning aligns with their core values, professional needs,
34 and the needs of their pupils, then pedagogical change is possible.

35 *Keywords:* Social and Emotional Learning, Experiential Learning, Critical Friends

36

Learning to use Teaching for Personal and Social Responsibility through action research

The development of pupils' social and emotional skills in school contexts is a key priority for many education systems world-wide (United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization [UNESCO], 2017). Furthermore, in many curricula, physical education (PE) is viewed as a logical site to promote, for example, positive and trusting relationships, coping skills, impulse control, and peaceful conflict resolution. The development of such skills can lead to improved behaviour, wellbeing, academic performance, and a positive school ethos (Durlak, Weissberg, Dymnicki, Taylor, & Schellinger, 2011; Taylor, Oberle, Durlak, & Weissberg, 2017). It is in the interest of all teachers and their learners, therefore, to develop knowledge and strategies that might nurture and promote social and emotional learning in schools, and specifically in PE (Jacobs & Wright, 2014). Teaching Personal and Social Responsibility (TPSR; Hellison, 2011) is a pedagogical model that was developed to promote positive youth development and social and emotional skills in PE and other physical activity contexts. The model has been developed and researched extensively over the last 40 years, with researchers uncovering a number of positive student outcomes including improved behaviour and attitudes (Hellison & Martinek, 2006), as well as improved responsibility and life skills (Metzler, 2017; Pozo, Grao-Cruces, & Perez-Ordas, 2016). However, researchers have also pointed out that we still know very little about how PE teachers learn to apply it in their own professional (learning) context (Beaudoin, 2012; Pozo et al., 2016). They call for further research to be carried out to explore the unique ways in which TPSR is understood and enacted in schools. This type of research will highlight the complexities and challenges that teachers face when learning in context, and also exemplify how these challenges might be overcome.

Teacher Learning

Research and educational policy world-wide recognise the importance of teacher learning and in doing so, emphasises the role of high quality Continued Professional Development (CPD) provision (Caena, 2011). Effective CPD has the potential to raise teaching standards in schools,

and thus, improve pupil experience and attainment (Armour, Quennerstedt, Chambers, & Makopoulou., 2017; Goodall, Day, Lindsay, Muijs, & Harris, 2005). However, there is little empirical evidence to suggest that traditional forms of CPD have a positive impact on teacher practice or educational outcomes for pupils (Goodall et al., 2005). Traditionally, CPD for teachers has included one-off courses that are ‘delivered’ by external providers. Resultantly, teachers’ learning experiences are often fragmented and incoherent and far removed from their day to day professional issues and challenges. Consequently, there has been a call for a change in the way in which CPD is provided (Armour & Yelling, 2004). Even the term ‘development’ has been identified as problematic as it suggests that the teacher is passive in the process (i.e., someone who can be developed to ‘be’ the expert teacher). Armour et al. (2017) instead argue that teachers should view themselves as learners, and recognise the complexity that this involves. Consequently, and inspired by the work of philosopher and social theorist John Dewey, Armour et al. (2017) developed a framework for effective CPD that recognises the complexity of learning. This framework positions teacher learning in context and focusses on the development of teacher knowledge for action (bridging research/theory with practice). From this perspective, learning is not conceived as knowledge to be ‘acquired’, but as personal growth with a nurturing environment that guides and shapes learning. Consequently, this Deweyan framework presents professional learning in terms of teacher engagement, where the teacher and their experiences are central to what, why, and how learning takes place. Consistent with Dewey’s (1938) theories of education and learning, experience is fundamental to this approach. Not only do learners bring their previous experiences to the current situation to create new experiences and knowledge, but the act of ‘doing’ provides the learner with richer experiences with which to create a deeper understanding. Thus, bodily experiences are part of the meaning making process and teachers themselves can begin to define the types of learning opportunities that they need, how they might foster their own learning, and who they might need to engage and interact with to enhance their learning.

The role of ‘others’ in the teacher learning process is important, particularly in terms of peer support and collaboration. Teachers do not learn in a vacuum; they require support, dialogue, and resources. Oliver, Luguetti, Aranda, Nuñez Enriquez, and Rodrigue (2017) draw attention to the importance of collaborative learning in their investigation that explored how teachers in different contexts learned to use an activist approach in PE. They point to several studies to demonstrate how teacher learning is more effective when learning communities are created, enabling teachers to share, examine, and reflect on their experiences. In this context, teachers are more willing to take risks and ultimately, learn and transform their practice (Oliver et al., 2017). Similarly, in a study that investigated a school-based CPD programme, Goodyear (2016) found that teachers worked together to sustain their learning. Goodyear also explains how her role as a researcher, external to the school context, supported their learning. For example, she was able to provide individualised advice and feedback that was specific to their needs and practise, which in turn, enhanced the teachers’ confidence in the learning process.

This collaborative approach to teacher learning forms part of what Garet, Porter, DeSimone, Birman, and Kwang (2001) describe as ‘Reform CPD’. Consistent with the Deweyan framework developed by Armour et al. (2017), Garet et al. (2001) suggest that ‘reform’ types of professional learning take place in schools, where teachers work collectively with other teachers, and where they are encouraged to make connections between existing knowledge and new experiences. Teachers are active in this learning process; they observe, plan, teach, and review, with colleagues (mentors or coaches) and with pupils. In doing so, their learning is in response to the emerging events that unfold in their work. To observe, reflect, and question is to take an ‘inquiry as stance’ position, where teachers take control of their own professional learning in the interest of their pupils. This resonates well with ideas around the reflective practitioner (Schön, 1983) and the teacher as the researcher (Stenhouse, 1975). Here, the teacher assumes the position of a ‘researcher’ or professional inquirer, one who observes, reflects, and transforms,

supporting Stenhouse's assertion that for teachers to engage with research, they must engage in it.

Action research is a form of research that aligns well with the conceptions of professional learning espoused by Armour et al., (2017) and Garet et al. (2001), where the teacher (and colleagues or external expert) is a central, deliberate, and contributing participant in the research process (Berg, 2004). It is collaborative and democratic process where the teacher identifies the problem in their local context and works out ways of solving it, increasing their social consciousness, and creating positive social change (Berg, 2004). However, although action research has been used widely as a means of raising social or political awareness in schools (Tinning, MacDonald, Tregenza, & Boustead, 1996), there is little evidence to suggest that it has been extensively adopted within the PE domain, even though researchers have highlighted the need for PE teachers to be more reflective about their practice through action research (Casey, Dyson, & Campbell, 2009). This may be especially important in the current climate of curriculum change, which suggests a shifting role for PE teachers as they become more accountable for the development of pupils' social and emotional skills and wellbeing (Gray, MacIsaac, & Jess, 2015). Action research, and its capacity to encourage reflection, problem-solving, and action therefore, may be a useful mechanism through which teachers can focus their learning in relation to this contemporary challenge (Armour et al., 2017).

Teaching Personal and Social Responsibility

TPSR (Hellison, 2011) is a pedagogical model in the field of PE that has the potential to promote social and emotional wellbeing through the development of personal and social skills (Metzler, 2017). It is similar to restorative practice (McCluskey, 2017) which, rather than focusing on the reduction of problematic behaviours among selected pupils, instead fosters positive personal and social competencies. TPSR was developed with the intent of using sport and physical activity as a vehicle to teach pupils life skills (e.g., self-management, goal-setting) that they can apply in other settings to help them reach their potential in life. The model is framed

around helping pupils take responsibility for and develop skills related to the ways they conduct themselves (personal responsibility) and interact with others (social responsibility). The core program goals include respecting the rights and feelings of others, self-motivation, self-direction, and caring. The final goal of TPSR is transfer, or the application of the values and behaviours promoted in the model to other setting such as the classroom, home, or community. A format of relational time (opportunities to connect positively with students on a one-to-one basis), awareness talk (group discussion about student responsibilities), physical activity plan (embedding student responsibilities into physical activity content), group meetings (opportunities for students to express their views), and reflective time (time to self-evaluate) is offered to provide some structure to each lesson (Beaudoin, 2012) and Hellison (2011), the founder of TPSR, proposed several empowerment-based instructional strategies to support teachers' implementation of the model. These include leadership roles, peer-coaching, self-reflection, and group debriefing sessions to guide implementation.

Importantly, Hellison (2011) actively encourages teachers and coaches to adapt strategies to fit their own context and teaching philosophy. Furthermore, it has been suggested that the effective integration of TPSR strategies in PE requires a significant level of teacher reflection, balanced with observation and input from others to support the process (Coulson, Irwin, & Wright, 2012; Hemphill, Templin, & Wright, 2015). Like action research, this perspective on teacher learning views the teacher as central to their own learning and capable of creating knowledge and practice (with others) that has a direct impact on their learners (Armour et al., 2017). Action research, therefore, may be a useful means by which teachers can develop their understanding and application of TPSR in their own school-setting.

Consequently, guided by the Deweyan framework developed by Armour et al. (2017), the purpose of this investigation was to explore the learning experiences of two teachers from different secondary schools in Scotland as they engaged in their respective action research projects. Both teachers used action research as a means to learn to apply TPSR in secondary level

PE to promote social and emotional learning and improve pupil behaviour. They worked with researchers external to their school context to develop their research ideas and share their experiences. Together they aimed to uncover the learning activities that the teachers engaged in, and explore the impact that this engagement had on their learning, teaching, and the learning experiences of their pupils. In doing so, we hope to illuminate the complexities of teacher learning, and identify the factors that contribute to successful learning and pedagogical change.

Methods

Research Design

Action research projects were conducted by two PE teachers, Simon and Robert. Given that the teachers in their own unique contexts were central to this process, we viewed their work as parallel interpretive qualitative case studies (Stake, 1995). Furthermore, both teachers worked within a small community of practice, with their pupils, within their PE department and with the two researchers, Sarah and Peter. Sarah and Peter are both experienced researchers in the fields of PE, pedagogy, and teacher learning. Peter is also an expert practitioner and academic in TPSR. They worked with Simon and Robert to develop their research aims and to support them in the role of critical friends, in other words, to scaffold, challenge, and bring alternative perspectives to their learning (Kember et al., 1997). Sarah and Peter also brought both teachers together upon completion of their respective inquiries to articulate, discuss (with the researchers and each other), analyze and understand their learning experiences. Ethical permission to work with the teachers was granted by the University ethics committee of their respective Institutes.

Participants and Setting

Simon. Simon (age 38 years) is a PE teacher and the curriculum leader for health and wellbeing in his school, which incorporates PE and Food and Health Technology. He held this position for one year at the time of his action research project. Before this, he was the principal teacher of PE at the same school for four years. He taught at this school for 11 years, with a teaching career of 12 years in total. The school is located near the outskirts of a major Scottish

city, with a school roll of approximately 620 pupils and four full-time teachers of PE (2 male, 2 female). The area that the school is located scores below the national average for indicators of socio-economic disadvantage.

The idea behind Simon's inquiry emerged from discussions with his Senior Leadership Team (SLT). Together, they identified six S1 boys (aged 12-13 years) to be part of a PE curriculum that was positioned outside of the main school curriculum. These were boys who had previously and consistently exhibited disruptive behaviors during lessons and all had been excluded from the school on at least one occasion. Simon taught this class for one period each week (approx. one hour) for two academic terms (13 weeks in total). He did not have a curriculum to follow; his aims were to develop his understanding and delivery of TPSR and understand the impact that this might have on the boys' learning experiences and behavior in his lessons, and in the school more widely.

Robert. At the time of his action research project, Robert (age 33 years) had been teaching PE for seven years, six of which were in his current school. Robert was also undertaking a Master's degree, and this action research project was aligned with one of the course modules and assessment. Robert was also a pupil support teacher for one day each week. In this post he was responsible for communicating with pupils, parents, colleagues, and outside agencies on a range of topics relating to the happiness and success of individual pupils at a school level and beyond. He was also responsible for teaching Personal and Social Education which incorporates a broad subject area essential for the development of life skills. The school is located in the center of the same Scottish city, with a school roll of around 1,200 pupils. The pupil population is very diverse at this school, with the pupils from the least and the most affluent areas of the city center.

Robert also worked with S1 pupils. This was a co-educational class of 25 pupils within which he identified eight boys who consistently demonstrated low-level, but disruptive behaviors. Robert taught the class twice each week and the curriculum activity was swimming.

Prior to this, Robert taught the same class for a term of football. He used these football lessons (2 each week for 8 weeks) to begin to think about how TPSR might be applied in context and began to ‘test’ some of the strategies that he had learned from the TPSR literature, as well as a TPSR CPD session that he had recently attended, which was delivered by Peter. However, the focus of his professional inquiry was swimming. There were eight swimming lessons in total, each lasting one hour, although this was typically reduced to 40 minutes in the pool to allow time to change. Robert’s aims for his class were, to a large extent, dictated by the PE curriculum at this school, namely to develop stroke technique. However, like Simon, he also aimed to address other issues related to his practice, TPSR, and pupil behavior and wellbeing. More specifically, he aimed to critically evaluate the impact that TPSR had on pupil behavior and social responsibility, and to develop his application of TPSR with a focus on investigating teaching strategies that might foster social wellbeing.

Teacher Data Collection

Both teachers primarily adopted qualitative methods to gather data about their learning experiences and the learning experiences of their pupils. Methods for both teachers included structured and collaborative reflections, peer observations, and pupil interviews. Simon, for example, was observed for eight out of the 13 lessons by Sarah, his critical friend. After each lesson, a discussion took place to reflect on Simon’s teaching, the boys’ behavioral and social responses, and any critical incidents. Notes from these meetings were typed up by Sarah and sent to Simon for review. Sarah also completed a TPSR implementation checklist (Wright & Walsh, 2018). This checklist addressed a range of indicators associated with quality TPSR implementation including lesson format (e.g., reflection time), goals (e.g., self-direction), teaching strategies (e.g., fostering social interaction), and pupil behaviors (e.g., helping others; Escartí, Wright, Pascual, & Gutiérrez, 2015; Hellison, 2011). This checklist acted as a fidelity guide for Simon and Sarah to ensure that the TPSR model was adhered to as much as possible. It also served as a post-teaching reflection tool for Simon and helped him to plan future lessons. Robert

was observed by a critical friend, a female PE teacher in the school with two years teaching experience. She had no previous knowledge of the TPSR model and she also used the implementation checklist to focus her observations and guide their post-lesson discussions. In addition to this, after each lesson, Robert rated and commented on his own teaching using the Tool for Assessing Responsibility-based Education (TARE; Wright, 2016). He did not use the TARE to objectively measure his teaching behaviors. Similar to Simon, he used it to identify, reflect and self-evaluate his teaching practices that promoted personal and social responsibility (Wright, 2016).

In their dual role of teacher-researcher, both teachers also carried out interviews with their pupils to explore their perceptions of their learning experiences during the TPSR sessions, specifically in relation to their understanding of the aims of each lesson, their learning, their behavior, and the impact that these experiences had on their learning and behavior in different contexts (transfer). While this has some limitations in terms of the power-relationship between the interviewer and the interviewee (Karnieli-Miller, Strier, & Pessach, 2009), the teachers viewed it as natural and logical component of their professional practice, as they frequently initiated dialogue with their pupils to evaluate their lessons. This represents what Wall and Hall (2017) describe as the principle of autonomy, where teachers have control over their research to make decisions about the best ways to answer their research questions.

Simon carried out paired interviews with all six boys (Wilson, Onwuegbuzie, & Manning, 2016). To encourage the boys to express themselves freely, Simon adopted a conversational interview style and did not use a voice recorder. Instead, immediately after each interview, Simon took notes to summarize the key issues raised. Each interview lasted between 15 and 20 minutes. Robert carried out a focus group interview at the end of his study with five pupils randomly selected from the eight pupils he previously identified as exhibiting more challenging behaviors. The interview lasted 30 minutes, was recorded using a digital voice recorder, and transcribed verbatim. Simon and Robert received informed consent from the pupils and their parents and

had permission to engage in their action research project from the head teacher of their respective schools.

Data Analysis

A practical iterative analysis (Srivasta & Hopwood, 2009) was adopted, where multiple stages of analysis took place from which further ideas emerged, new connections were made, and a deeper understanding was generated (Berkowitz, 1997). This approach is based on the premise that qualitative data analysis is highly reflexive, fundamentally iterative, and progressively focusing (Srivasta & Hopwood, 2009). Firstly, both Simon and Robert examined their data to explore and understand ideas related to their learning activities, their learning, teaching, and pupil experience. Both teachers were then invited to discuss their findings individually with Sarah, which generated further understandings of their learning experiences. After these meetings, both teachers were invited by Sarah to share their experiences and findings with each other. This provided them with another opportunity to develop and focus their ideas, but also encouraged them to uncover previously unconsidered experiences as a result of ideas triggered by the ‘other’ teacher (Wilson et al., 2016).

To develop a more refined and focused understanding of the teachers’ learning experiences (Srivasta & Hopwood, 2009), the individual discussions and the paired discussions were recorded, transcribed, and analyzed by Sarah. This analysis involved considering the texts as units of meanings and assigning phrases that reflected these meanings. A constant comparative method of analysis (Glaser, 1965) was then used to identify common themes within the text. These common themes were then shared with Simon and Robert and a ‘follow-up’ meeting was arranged with each teacher individually. This was to pose further questions to explore any underdeveloped themes and acted as a form of member checking to ensure a shared and accurate understanding of the key themes. A final meeting was held with three co-authors (Sarah, Simon, and Robert) to review the key themes. This also provided a useful opportunity to highlight the similarities and differences in experiences and learning between the teachers,

further establishing key themes, but also emphasizing those that were unique to each context. It is important to note that the relationship between Sarah, Peter, Simon, and Robert was one that was already established prior to embarking upon their inquiry. Sarah had previously been involved with Simon in another research project and met Robert at a CPD event led by Peter. Peter had previously met both Simon and Robert, visited their schools, observed their typical teaching practice, and conducted interviews with them. This facilitated numerous open and honest discussions over time, the establishment of shared goals and expectations, thus enhancing the trustworthiness of the reflective and data analysis processes, particularly in relation to their dependability and credibility (Lincoln & Guba, 1985).

Discussion of Results

Teacher learning is complex (Armour et al., 2017) and influenced by many interacting components within and between the individual and their environment (Jess, Keay & Carse, 2016). The pathways that teachers take in their learning, therefore, can be unique, messy, and non-linear. The following discussion explores the key themes that have shaped the teachers' learning journeys, journeys that they have come to understand by sharing their experiences and learning with each other. Specifically, it examines how their values and contexts, experiences and collaborations, the perspectives of the pupils, and the challenges they faced influenced how they learned to apply TPSR.

Same Values, Different Contexts

Shared personal and professional values. Both teachers were situated in different contexts, but shared similar values around teaching and learning. Simon and Robert expressed their desire to learn, to improve and to provide their pupils with more positive learning experiences. In highlighting why he was drawn to TPSR, Robert said:

I knew that I taught the physical skills explicitly and knew that I was only ever reactive to anything in my class for behavior or how they were communicating to

each other. And I needed, I needed something to understand how to teach that, the social aspect.

Both Robert and Simon aimed to impact upon the personal and social development of their pupils in the PE context, but also in the wider school community. For example, in justifying his reasons for engaging with his project, Simon said during his initial data-analysis meeting with Sarah:

It's a thing that I've long had on my radar, you know, it's something I've always felt. That sport had a, a hook really to get a lot of the pupils that we do struggle with behavior round the school, get them involved and get them engaged wi' school a bit better.

Previous research has shown that PE teachers will sustain their efforts in professional learning activities when they understand the direct benefits for their pupils (Gray, Treacy & Hall, 2017). In addition, research has demonstrated that teachers are more likely to engage in professional learning when the focus of that learning builds upon their own beliefs and current practices (Armour et al., 2017; Garet et al., 2001). In the present study, both Simon and Robert described the ways that their past experiences of restorative practices (McCluskey, 2017), and the importance that they both placed on the development of social and emotional skills in PE acted as a powerful incentive for them to learn about TPSR. They described TPSR as a good 'fit' with their beliefs and previous experiences, or in Deweyan terms it offered 'continuity of experience' (Dewey, 1938). For example, during his initial data analysis meeting, Robert stated, "we have a restorative behaviour system in the school so I felt like I did marry in with it quite well." However, although both initiated and sustained their learning because of these shared goals, beliefs and values, there were features of their unique contexts that created very different environments for their learning.

Simon's context: Active support. Simon's context and his role within his context were quite different from Robert. Simon was a senior teacher who began his learning journey in

consultation with, and with the full support of his SLT. In the first individual follow-up meeting with Sarah, he explained that he worked closely with his SLT to develop a strategy that might enable the boys to lead a successful life in the school and, ultimately, lead a successful life after school. **Simon** intimated that this collaboration, trust, and shared vision enabled the SLT to offer **Simon** the freedom to develop his understanding and application of TPSR with this group of boys, with no pressure, no fear of failure, and no top-down, prescribed curriculum to follow. This is a highly unusual situation and in stark contrast to the working conditions of many teachers who are bound by curricular demands and other forms of output regulation of their work (Biesta, Priestley & Robinson, 2015). **Simon** appeared to be in a context that allowed him to be more agentic, where he could build upon his past experiences to create opportunities in the present and shape a more optimistic vision for the future. Importantly, this was facilitated by the support and resources offered by his SLT and his work with Sarah. This reflects a form of ‘ecological agency’ proposed by Biesta et al. (2015) who suggest that achieving such agency is critical if teachers are to engage with policy and change in more meaningful ways. Further dimensions of **Simon’s** ‘ecology’ were the staff in his department. They supported, facilitated, and enhanced his learning by sharing their own experiences of developing social and emotional skills. This was a reciprocal process where they actively sought ideas from **Simon** about his learning so that they might also learn.

Robert’s context: Passive support. Rather than co-developing his ideas with his SLT or his PE department, **Robert** developed his ideas for learning from his professional reflections, in combination with his engagement in a Master’s degree and meeting Peter and Sarah. He worked with ‘external experts’ who were able to focus on his needs, helping to develop his knowledge, and increase his confidence (Goodyear, 2016). In this sense, **like Simon**, his learning was collaborative and influenced by context, but this was a different context. **Robert** did share his ideas with his PE department, and in doing so, they encouraged him to pursue his studies, offered their time to observe his lessons, and supported him with his reflective practice.

However, they did not engage with, and did not seem to be influenced by his learning in the same way that Simon's PE department was. Furthermore, Robert was bound by a pre-determined curriculum, with specific learning outcomes that he had to achieve and for which he remained accountable. Thus, the 'ecology' within which his 'agency' was afforded, was very different to that of Simon. Yet despite this, Robert's individual efforts and search for resources beyond the contextual and structural confines of the school resulted in his continued learning and commitment to TPSR. In his efforts to become a better, more knowledgeable teacher, he initiated professional and regular dialogue with 'external experts' who helped him to develop his knowledge of TPSR, understand the research process, and offer advice about planning for the future (Timperley, Parr, & Bertanees, 2009).

Experiential and Collaborative Learning

Applying the model 'on the job.' For Dewey (1938), experience is a process through which we learn. It is an on-going process of interaction between past, present, self and context that allows us to learn from our day to day encounters. An important feature of the teachers' learning in the present study was the way they experienced TPSR, actively engaging with it in the busy, complex, and dynamic context of the school environment. Thus, their learning experiences were shaped by the 'new' ways in which they interacted with this environment. These 'new' ways included being much more explicit before, during, and after their lessons about the social and emotional skills that they aimed to teach. This type of learning 'on the job' can be very challenging for teachers, but particularly in a context where performance or academic outcomes are typically prioritized over social and emotional outcomes (Jacobs & Wright, 2014). Indeed, both teachers did find this challenging, yet they remained committed to the model and their learning, making explicit, consistent, regular, and clear connections between the pupils' PE experiences, their personal and social learning, and their lives in other contexts. For example, there was evidence from the TPSR implementation checklist and post-lesson reflections to indicate that they began each lesson by stating their social and emotional learning intentions, they

developed learning from previous weeks, they praised positive behaviors (for example, listening, taking turns, not talking out of turn, showing empathy and sympathy), modelled respectful behavior and created numerous opportunities for their pupils to related to the teacher and to each other (relational time and reflective time). For example, in her post-lesson reflections notes after Simon's 5th lesson (volleyball), Sarah wrote:

None of the boys got shouted at today (I can't imagine that they do not get shouted at or excluded from other lessons). Instead, Simon calmly asked them to sit out for a while, spoke to them, asked them if they were ready to take part again and what they needed to do to stay on court.

While both teachers remained committed to the model, their engagement in the research process, their on-going learning and reflection and their deep understanding of their pupils in context also allowed them to apply the model in a more flexible way. This exemplifies Hellison's (2011) vision that teachers should make TPSR their own, rather than viewing it as a prescribed curriculum. For example, both teachers began to understand and embrace what they described as 'teachable' moments. In other words, they began to see social and emotional behaviors (both positive and negative) as opportunities for pupil learning, rather than as moments to be ignored, or moments where pupils had to be punished. Simon and Robert both explained that when pupils exhibited negative behaviors (for example, not listening, arguing, and being disrespectful to peers) they did not shout at them, they were not punished nor were they excluded from the classroom. Instead, the teachers described how they would use this as an opportunity to discuss the behavior with the pupil so that they might understand the cause of the problem, the impact of the problem and work out ways of learning from the situation. For example, in the final data analysis meeting with Sarah, Robert, and Simon, Robert said:

But actually with TPSR, you can let some behaviors go if it's not dangerous or anything. If they're not putting in all their effort, they definitely aren't, they're off task, they've just hit another tennis ball across there, I'll remember that at the end. But then

you draw them in at the end and it's, 'right here's, here's what I saw' and then we can discuss.

In these instances, the teachers were able to draw from their knowledge and past experiences of 'restorative practice' where those involved in the 'incident' are encouraged to discuss and understand their behaviors and, at the same time, build more positive relationships with their peers and their teachers (McCluskey, 2017).

Critical friends. The role of the 'critical friend' within the action research process is commonly used as a means of "developing the reflective and learning capacity of the teacher in a supportive and cooperative manner" (Kember et al., 1997, p. 464). This is interesting because, although both Robert and Simon invited a critical friend to observe their teaching and support their reflections, their critical friends came from different contexts, which resulted in quite different learning experiences. Sarah acted as Simon's critical friend. They had worked together previously on research projects related to the development of PE pedagogy and had thus developed a good working relationship which was underpinned by trust and a shared desire to learn. While Sarah had engaged in the TPSR literature, she had limited knowledge about how TPSR was implemented in schools and was keen to observe Simon's teaching so that they could support each other's learning. This became a shared learning experience, one that both Sarah and Simon highly valued because they both brought different, but complimentary perspectives to the learning environment. Simon experienced TPSR first hand, interacting directly with the content and his learners. However, Sarah observed things that Simon did not, and encouraged him to create the time and the space to reflect upon his teaching and the boys' learning in a way that he had not previously experienced. During the first data analysis meeting with Sarah, Simon highlighted:

I think having yourself there to observe from the outside and then reflect back what you'd witnessed in the lesson. And then also being able to then put forward my own reflections and then kinda batter that out a bit, directly after each lesson, I think was

452 hugely valuable because quite often my personal reflections as I finished the lesson
453 were different seven or eight minutes later after we had a discussion about it. You
454 know, very much, it very much changed because, because you gave an alternative
455 viewpoint. And then I was able to reflect slightly differently on it.

456 These processes enabled Simon to explore his teaching in more depth, enhancing his knowledge
457 of TPSR, but also giving him more confidence in himself and this approach (Goodyear, 2016).

458 Robert worked with several external critical friends, including Sarah and Peter, engaging
459 in critical discussions about his teaching, pupil learning and his research beyond the school gates.
460 However, he also had a critical friend from within the school who he invited to observe and
461 discuss his lessons. This critical friend was one of his work colleagues who volunteered her time
462 to support him in his investigation. Thus, she brought her day to day experiences of working
463 with similar pupils in a busy and complex workspace to her observations. Consequently, her
464 feedback was very practical in nature and, at times, intimated some resistance to the model. For
465 example, she would often advise on how she would do things differently, especially in relation to
466 managing pupil behavior. For example, after one of the lessons she suggested:

467 You would say to the class your actions are having an impact on our ability to
468 proceed. Otherwise we're not going to get games or something like that. I
469 thought that happened a bit towards the end but like with the restorative
470 approach that we have some kids just take advantage of it. So, some kids realised
471 that they weren't really going to get a row off you. Sometimes three-strikes is
472 clearer for pupils.

473 Furthermore, because she had taught the class previously and knew them well, there were times
474 when she 'stepped in' to stop low-level disruptive behaviors. Baskerville and Goldblatt (2009)
475 suggest that a precursor to developing any critical friendship should be reflection and discussion
476 around the values, beliefs, and goals of the teacher. Robert's critical friend at times challenged
477 and contradicted his beliefs, values, and goals. However, while he was initially rather frustrated

by her perspective and comments, it resulted in an emotional and embodied response, and thus a richer learning experience and a deeper understanding of his teaching, pupil learning, and TPSR (Armour et al., 2017; Dewey, 1938).

Understanding the Pupils' Perspectives

A more democratic and positive learning environment. In line with previous studies that have explored the impact of TPSR on pupil learning (Pozo et al., 2016) both teachers believed that one of the main benefits of using TPRS (and carrying out their action research) was that it encouraged them to talk to their pupils more. This then helped them to develop more positive and respectful relationships that involve listening and responding. Simon never shouted at his pupils. They did at times demonstrate some inappropriate behaviors, but Simon dealt with this during his relational time, or he invited the boys themselves to solve the problem. For example, during the volleyball sessions, most of the boys wanted to play football with the volleyball. To stop them from kicking the balls, Simon asked the pupils to think about how they might be encouraged to stop kicking the ball so that they would not be damaged. They came up with a '*3-strikes and you are out*' rule which they applied successfully and complicity. This example is typical of the lessons Simon taught, where he engaged the boys in discussions, listened to their views, responded to their suggestions, and helped them to evaluate their outcomes. This provided them with opportunities to make decisions and take on board leadership roles, opportunities that they usually responded very well to.

Creating as many opportunities for leadership and decision-making was more difficult for Robert, especially in the context of swimming. However, he did manage to do this during the football session and, even in swimming, the pupils were offered choices about their learning. For example, while the school curriculum dictated that the pupils had to develop stroke technique, the pupils were also offered choices and opportunities to engage in alternative water-based activities, such as water polo or volleyball. This involved discussion, negotiation, and compromise. It gave Robert an opportunity to build his relationship with the pupils and allowed

him to model respectful behaviors. Given the difficulties that Robert had in the swimming pool with TPSR, modelling respect became one of the main ways in which he attempted to promote personal and social responsibility. He frequently highlighted to the pupils the positive ways in which they interacted with him on a one to one basis and challenged them to do the same when communicating with each other. If pupil interaction was positive, he would question the group on the effect this had on classroom atmosphere and challenged them to continue to interact positively with one another beyond the PE context.

Pupils' understanding of TPSR. Although Robert had a larger class compared to Simon, which sometimes made it more challenging to communicate effectively with all pupils, many of the pupils in his class were highly aware of his learning intentions and he did observe changes in levels of self-control and respect for some pupils, although not always consistently. During one of the post-lesson discussions with his critical friend, she stated, "I thought that a group of the lads who would be kind of your messers, I saw them taking a leadership role, telling their mates to be quiet."

However, Robert also learned from his pupils that some of his learning intentions were not well understood. For example, the focus group interview with his pupils Robert learned that the pupils did not understand what he meant when he said: '*set yourself a behavioral goal for the lesson*'.

One of the boys explained, "I did some behaviour goals but they are quite hard to come up with so I think you should give some suggestions before you do it because it's quite hard." Another said, "I never really remember them because you think about them in your mind at the start and then you just forget about it."

This was an important learning opportunity for Robert and had a direct impact on his practice. During his final data analysis meeting with Sarah, he explained that he continues to be more explicit with his pupils about what respectful, cooperative, and supportive behaviors look like, using both his and his pupils' behaviors as examples. In addition, he is now more aware about

529 how he communicates with his pupils and understands that they might interpret him in ways that
530 he did not intend.

531 Interestingly, while the boys from Simon's class did not raise the issue of language or not
532 understanding his instructions or questions, it was discussed frequently by Sarah and Simon.
533 There were several comments made in the post lesson discussions and reflective notes where
534 Sarah and Simon both had a concern about the language that was used in the TPSR literature,
535 and how it may not be a language form that the pupils were familiar with. Consequently, each
536 week, Simon made slight changes to the ways in which he presented the lesson objectives,
537 gradually moving away from some of the terms used in the literature towards a language that the
538 boys could relate to. This is exemplified in Sarah's post-lesson notes from the third lesson:

539 Simon started off by looking at the learning intentions and the success criteria.

540 Interestingly, they were not presented in the same way as before. They were not
541 presented as the 5 levels. They were really clear and simple statements about how they
542 should behave and to consider how their behaviors might impact on others. This made
543 more sense to me and I think more sense to the boys.

544 This on-going reflection and change may have been why the boys that Simon spoke to all
545 seemed to have a very good grasp of the things that Simon was trying to achieve in each lesson.
546 Indeed, Simon was surprised at how articulate they were in recalling the ideas that they were
547 presented with. They recognized that this was a different experience from their 'usual' PE
548 lessons, one that aimed to improve their behavior in PE and the wider school context. During
549 the paired interviews, they appeared to understand how to behave well in PE, and indeed they
550 did behave well in PE. However, they also discussed that they found this very difficult to do in
551 other contexts. In other areas of the school they described how they felt targeted by some
552 teachers and that they saw little relevance in the topics they had to study, both factors
553 contributing towards their disruptive behaviors in class.

It appears, therefore that the smaller class size that Simon was afforded allowed him to connect more frequently with this small group of boys in this PE context. Hellison (2011), who did much of his work in alternative schools and after school programs with smaller class sizes (e.g., 10-12 pupils), has noted that it is easier to individualize instruction, build pedagogical relationships, and create a more democratic environment when teaching smaller groups. Despite some challenges associated with class size, several reports indicate TPSR can be implemented with larger classes (e.g., 25 to 35 pupils) in more typical PE programs (Pozo et al., 2016). In the current study, despite the different contexts in which Simon and Robert operated, both teachers faced similar challenges with their learning and teaching.

Overcoming the Challenges of Teacher Learning

Challenges, doubts, and discomfort. Pedagogical change can be extremely challenging for teachers (Casey & Dyson, 2009). It can be a slow process, with many barriers to overcome, accompanied by enduring feelings of doubt and uncertainty. Both Simon and Robert noted times during their inquiry where they had doubts about the project and their teaching. During the initial data analysis meeting with Sarah, Robert said:

So I'm trying not to judge, so I feel like with learning TPSR, my teaching's also almost sometimes taken a step backwards because it's not an automatic process of teaching.

I've gotten into a way of teaching that's comfortable to me. And so learning TPSR and implementing it, there's a lot going on in your head. It's like being a probationer and being in front of you class and learning the curriculum.

Simon found it difficult to move from a teaching approach that focused on the development of movement skills. He found it a challenge not to slip back to focusing more on the technical development of skills, rather than remaining explicitly focused on the development of social and emotional skills. Class size and activity type were identified by Robert as major challenges. He felt that swimming was a difficult activity to apply TPSR effectively because of his concerns around pupil safety. He felt that he had to be able to observe the class at all times, which made it

difficult for him to have one-to-one time with the pupils, a problem that was intensified by the poor acoustics in the swimming pool.

While there were some differences between the teachers in terms of their challenges, they both explained the difficulties they had in moving away from an approach that they were comfortable with. They highlighted the discomfort they felt initially when 'let certain behaviors go' to create teachable moments to deal with behaviors in a more positive and democratic way. This discomfort was especially intense for Robert, who also had his colleague observing his practice, a colleague who perhaps did not understand TPSR in the same way. As a result, he became highly sensitive and even critical towards his own practice and felt the need to justify himself and convince her of the benefits of using this approach. Simon also became more sensitive towards his teaching, but was less self-critical, possibly because he worked so closely with Sarah who was able to offer a more knowledgeable and positive perspective on his work.

Continuous and collaborative learning over time. In line with previous research that positions teachers as learners in context (Casey & Dyson, 2009; Dyson, Colby, & Barratt, 2016), both Robert and Simon began to recognize that meaningful pedagogic change takes time. They discussed how they felt like the change process was much slower than they expected, and that they have become more aware and accepting of the fact there may be significant periods of difficulty and challenge that must be overcome before any noticeable change takes place. For example, during his data analysis discussion with Sarah at the end of his project, Simon said:

I think I've seen some changes. I suppose part of it's almost in my, my mind-set shift is probably how I've overcome it because instead of looking at it and thinking that I'll see vast changes in their behavior across the school overnight, I've gotta look for almost sorta small targets, small goals within that.

Despite this challenge, both remained very positive about TPSR, describing again how it allowed them to build on their previous practice and it aligned with their values around education and physical education. Martinek and Hellison (2016) highlight that learning to apply TPSR in

context is extremely challenging, but that challenges can be overcome with a commitment to and a belief in the core values of TPSR. This is evident in the present study as both teachers continue to apply and investigate their use of TPSR in a supportive and collaborative learning environment, creating time to reflect on their learning with their pupils, their peers and with Sarah and Peter. In addition to learning through their own inquiries, the collaborative nature and process of analyzing their data and writing this paper has also given them the opportunity to learn from each other. They were able to draw from their experiences to discuss the various ways in TPSR might be used in different contexts. These discussions further highlighted the value in working collaboratively, with both teachers suggesting that they may in the future find time to observe each other teacher in the next phase of their professional inquiry.

Summary and Conclusion

Armour et al. (2017) proposed a framework that recognises the complexity of learning in context, where teachers develop knowledge for action (bridging research/theory with practice) that supports their professional growth throughout their career. Consequently, they propose that the core focus of teacher learning should be “practice itself (i.e., embedded and contextualized); learning is dynamic (active and requiring time for reflection); and it is never ending (continuing)” (p.10). Reflecting this view, the action research projects that the teachers in the present study carried out, encouraged them to explore different ways of engaging with their learners, reflect, discuss, and plan activities that have taken them on a learning journey that continues to this date. A number of factors have shaped this journey, including their unique contexts. Simon’s investigation derived from his collaboration with and support from his SLT. Robert was supported by his school but was perhaps more motivated and supported by factors that were external to his school context. However, these were not the only factors that influenced their learning. For example, both teachers had a strong and intrinsic desire to learn, do the best for their pupils, and both had core values that aligned well with those of TPSR. These core values were the catalyst for learning and change, encouraging them to set ‘new’ learning objectives,

apply a variety of ‘new’ teaching strategies, talk more to their pupils, change their own behaviors, and importantly, reflect with others to evaluate the impact that these changes had on them and their learners. Their experiences of learning to apply TPSR in context have provided a platform to explore their learning, develop their understanding, and create new knowledge that will ultimately influence future experiences (Downey & Clandinin, 2010). This reflects Dewey’s (1938) notion of learning as growth, where learning is an on-going process of experience and sense making (Armour et al., 2017). Importantly, they did this despite at times feeling uncomfortable and despite not seeing immediate changes in their pupils’ behaviors. This may be because such deep and collaborative engagement in learning has enabled them to develop a critical understanding of TPSR so that they can adapt and apply it flexibly to focus on the specific needs of their pupils.

Teacher learning is difficult and complex and those responsible for organizing learning opportunities for teachers need to consider the environment required to nurture teacher learning. However, this research demonstrates that teacher learning can take place even when the support structures within the school are perhaps more passive. There is evidence from the present study that when teachers are committed to their own learning, prepared to devote time to their learning, and when the subject of their learning aligns with their core values, professional needs, and the needs of their pupils, then they will seek support from elsewhere and pedagogical change is possible. Research often reports that teachers fail to engage in professional learning because of the various pressures and constraints they are under from other areas of the curriculum and school life (Muijs & Harris, 2006). The teachers in this study were not immune to these pressures, yet they still devoted time and effort to their learning and inquiry. Understanding why some teachers appear to be more committed to professional learning is an area of research that requires further consideration. Future research might consider investigating teacher learning from a broader perspective to understand how it is positioned among, and interacts with, their other professional responsibilities. There are perhaps also implications here for Initial Teacher

658 Education providers, who might consider ways in which they could nurture an enduring interest
659 in teacher learning and action research, and support the development of skills that will enable
660 pre-service PE teachers to navigate their learning journey in an extremely complex and
661 demanding space.
662

663 **References**

- 664 Armour, K. & Yelling, M. (2004). Continuing professional development for experienced physical
 665 education teachers: Towards effective provision. *Sport, Education and Society*, 9, 95-114.
 666 doi:10.1080/1357332042000175836
- 667 Armour, K., Quennerstedt, M., Chambers F., & Makopoulou, K. (2017). What is ‘effective’ CPD
 668 for contemporary physical education teachers? A Deweyan framework. *Sport, Education*
 669 *and Society*, 22, 799-811. doi:10.1080/13573322.2015.1083000
- 670 Baskerville, D., & Goldblatt, H. (2009). Learning to be a critical friend: From professional
 671 indifference through challenge to unguarded conversations. *Cambridge Journal of Education*,
 672 39(2), 205-221. doi:10.1080/03057640902902260
- 673 Beaudoin, S. (2012). Using responsibility-based strategies to empower in-service physical
 674 education and health teachers to learn and implement TPSR. *Agora Para la Educación*
 675 *Física y el Deporte*, 14, 161–177.
- 676 Berg, B.L. (2004). *Qualitative research methods for the social sciences*. Boston, MA: Pearson Education.
- 677 Berkowitz, S. (1997). Analyzing qualitative data. In J. Frechtling & L. Sharp (Eds.), *User-friendly*
 678 *handbook for mixed method evaluations*. Arlington, VA: Division of Research, Evaluation and
 679 Communication, National Science Foundation. Retrieved from
 680 <https://www.nsf.gov/pubs/1997/nsf97153/start.htm>
- 681 Biesta, G., Priestley, M., & Robinson, S. (2015). The role of beliefs in teacher agency. *Teachers and*
 682 *Teaching*, 21, 624-640. doi: 10.1080/13540602.2015.104432
- 683 Caena, F. (2011). *Literature review: Quality in teachers’ continuing professional development*. Directorate-
 684 General for Education and Culture, European Commission.

- 685 Casey, A. & Dyson, B. (2009). The implementation of models-based practice in physical
 686 education through action research. *European Physical Education Review*, 15, 175-199.
 687 doi:10.1177/1356336X09345222
- 688 Casey, A., Dyson, B., & Campbell, A. (2009). Action research in physical education: Focusing
 689 beyond myself through cooperative learning. *Educational Action Research*, 17, 407-423,
 690 doi:10.1080/09650790903093508
- 691 Coulson, C., Irwin, C., & Wright, P.M. (2012). Applying Hellison's Responsibility Model in a
 692 youth residential treatment facility: A practical inquiry project. *Agora for Physical Education*
 693 *and Sport*, 14, 38-54.
- 694 Dewey, J. (1938). *Experience and education*. New York, NY: Touchstone.
- 695 Downey, C.A., & Clandinin, D.J. (2010). Narrative inquiry as reflective practice: Tensions and
 696 possibilities. In N. Lyons (Ed.), *Handbook of reflection and reflective practice: A way of knowing*
 697 *for professional reflective inquiry* (pp. 383-397). New York, NY: Springer.
- 698 Durlak, J. A., Weissberg, R.P., Dymnicki, A. B., Taylor, R.D., & Schellinger, K. B. (2011). The
 699 impact of enhancing students' social and emotional learning: A meta-analysis of school-
 700 based universal interventions. *Child Development*, 82, 405-432.
- 701 Dyson, B., Colby, R., & Barratt, M. (2016). The co-construction of cooperative learning in
 702 physical education with elementary classroom teachers. *Journal of Teaching in Physical*
 703 *Education*, 35, 370-380. doi:0.1123/jtpe.2016-0119
- 704 Escartí, A., Wright, P. M., Pascual, C., & Gutiérrez, M. (2015). Tool for Assessing Responsibility-
 705 based Education (TARE) 2.0: Instrument revisions, inter-rater reliability, and correlations
 706 between observed teaching strategies and student behaviors. *Universal Journal of Psychology*,
 707 3, 55-63.

- 708 Garet, M. S., Porter, A. C., DeSimone, L., Birman, B. F., & Kwang, S.Y. (2001). what makes
 709 professional development effective? Results from a national sample of teachers. *American*
 710 *Educational Research Association*, 38, 915-945.
- 711 Glaser, B.G. (1965). The constant comparative method of qualitative analysis. *Social Problems*, 12,
 712 436-445.
- 713 Goodall, J., Day, C., Lindsay, G., Muijs, D., & Harris, A. (2005). *Evaluating the impact of continuing*
 714 *professional development (CPD)* (No. Reference: RR659). London, UK: Department for
 715 Education and Skills.
- 716 Goodyear, V.A. (2016). Sustained professional development on cooperative learning: Impact on
 717 six teachers' practices and students' learning. *Research Quarterly for Exercise and Sport*, 88,
 718 83-94. doi:10.1080/02701367.2016.1263381
- 719 Gray, S, MacIsaac, S., & Jess, M. (2015). Teaching 'health' in physical education in a 'healthy'
 720 way. *RETOS: Nuevas tendencias en Educacion Fisica Deportes y Recreacion*, 28, 165-172.
- 721 Gray, S., Treacy, J., & Hall, E.T. (2017). Re-engaging disengaged pupils in physical education: An
 722 appreciative inquiry perspective. *Sport, Education and Society*, 1-15.
 723 doi:10.1080/13573322.2017.1374942
- 724 Hellison, D. (2011). *Teaching responsibility through physical activity*. Champaign, IL: Human Kinetics.
- 725 Hellison, D., & Martinek, T. (2006). Social and individual responsibility programs. In D. Kirk, D.
 726 MacDonald, & M. O'Sullivan (Eds.), *The handbook of physical education* (pp. 610-626).
 727 London, UK: Sage.

- 728 Hemphill, M. A., Templin, T. J., & Wright, P. M. (2015). Implementation and outcomes of a
 729 responsibility-based continuing professional development protocol in physical education.
 730 *Sport, Education, and Society*, 20, 398-419.
- 731 Jacobs, J., & Wright, P. (2014). Social and emotional learning policies and physical education.
 732 *Strategies*, 27(6), 42-44, doi:10.1080/08924562.2014.960292
- 733 Jacobs, J. M., & Wright, P. M. (2016). An alternative application of imagery in youth sport:
 734 Promoting the transfer of life skills to other contexts. *Journal of Sport Psychology in Action*, 7,
 735 1-10. doi:10.1080/21520704.2015.1123205
- 736 Jess, M., Keay, J., & Carse, N. (2016). Primary physical education: A complex learning journey
 737 for children and teachers. *Sport, Education and Society*, 21, 1018-1035.
 738 doi:10.1080/13573322.2014.979142
- 739 Karnieli-Miller O, Strier R, & Pessach L. (2009). Power relations in qualitative research.
 740 *Qualitative Health Research*, 19, 279–289. doi:org/10.1177/1049732308329306
- 741 Kember, D., Ha, T-S., Lam, B-H., Lee, A., Sandra, N.G , Yan, L., & Yum, J.C.K. (1997). The
 742 diverse role of the critical friend in supporting educational action research projects.
 743 *Educational Action Research*, 5, 463-481, doi:10.1080/09650799700200036
- 744 Lincoln, Y.S., & Guba, E. G. (1985). *Naturalistic inquiry*. London, UK: Sage.
- 745 Martinek, T., & Hellison, D. (2016). Teaching Personal and Social Responsibility: Past, Present
 746 and Future. *Journal of Physical Education, Recreation & Dance*, 87, 9-13.
 747 doi:10.1080/07303084.2016.1157382

- 748 McCluskey, G. (2017). Closing the attainment gap in Scottish schools: Three challenges of an
 749 unequal society. *Education, Citizenship and Social Justice*, 12, 24-35.
 750 doi:10.1177/1746197916683468
- 751 Metzler, M. (2017). *Instructional models in physical education*. London, UK: Routledge.
- 752 Muijs, D., & Harris, H. (2006). Teacher led school improvement: Teacher leadership in the UK.
 753 *Teacher and Teacher Education*, 22, 961-972.
- 754 Oliver, K.L., Luguetti, C., Aranda, R., Nuñez Enriquez, O., & Rodrigue, A. (2017). 'Where do I
 755 go from here?': Learning to become activist teachers through a community of practice.
 756 *Physical Education and Sport Pedagogy*, 23, 150-165, doi:10.1080/17408989.2017.1350263
- 757 Pozo, P., Grao-Cruces, A., & Pérez-Ordás, R. (2016). Teaching personal and social responsibility
 758 model-based programmes in physical education: A systematic review. *European Physical*
 759 *Education Review*, 24, 56-75. doi:10.1177/1356336X16664749
- 760 Schön, D. (1983). *The reflective practitioner: How professionals think in action*. London, UK: Temple
 761 Smith.
- 762 Srivastava, P., & Hopwood, N. (2009). A practical iterative framework for qualitative data
 763 analysis. *International Journal of Qualitative Methods*, 8, 76-84.
- 764 Stake, R. E. (1995). *The art of case study research*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- 765 Stenhouse, L. (1975). *An introduction to curriculum research and development*. London, UK: Heinemann.
- 766 Taylor, R.D., Oberle, E., Durlak, J.A., & Weissberg, R.P. (2017). promoting positive youth
 767 development through school-based social and emotional learning interventions: A meta-
 768 analysis of follow-up effects. *Child Development*, 88, 1156-1171.

- 769 Timperley, H. S., Parr, J.M., & Bertanees, C. (2009). Promoting professional inquiry for
 770 improved outcomes for students in New Zealand. *Professional Development in Education*, 35,
 771 227-245. doi:10.1080/13674580802550094
- 772 Tinning, R., Macdonald, D., Tregenza, K., & Boustead, J. (1996). Action research and the
 773 professional development of teachers in the health and physical education field: The
 774 Australian NPDP experience. *Educational Action Research*, 4, 389-405.
 775 doi:10.1080/0965079960040308
- 776 United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO). (2017). Sixth
 777 International Conference of Ministers and Senior Officials Responsible for Physical
 778 Education and Sport (MINEPS VI) [Final Report]. Paris: Author.
- 779 Wall, K., & Hall, E. (2017). The teacher in teacher-practitioner research: three principles of
 780 inquiry. In P. Boyd, & A. Szplit (Eds.), *Teachers and Teacher Educators Learning Through*
 781 *Inquiry: International Perspectives* (pp. 35-62). Kielce-Kraków: Wydawnictwo Attyka.
- 782 Wilson, A.D., Onwuegbuzie, A.J., & Manning, L.P. (2016). Using paired depth interviews to
 783 collect qualitative data. *The Qualitative Report*, 21, 1549-1573.
- 784 Wright, P. (2016). Improving TPSR implementation with a structured post-teaching reflection
 785 tool. *Active and Healthy Magazine*, 23, 12-16.
- 786 Wright, P. M., & Walsh, D. (2018). Teaching personal and social responsibility. In W. Li, M.
 787 Wang, P. Ward, & S. Sutherland (Eds.), *Curricular models of physical education* (pp. 140-208).
 788 Beijing, China: Higher Education.

789

790